

Evans Fears Schuttert McNulty Mickus
6720 Via Austi Parkway, Suite 300
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Jay J. Schuttert, Esq. (SBN 8656)
David W. Gutke, Esq. (SBN 9820)
Brennen D Marshall, Esq. (SBN 16578)
EVANS FEARS SCHUTTERT MCNULTY MICKUS
6720 Via Austi Parkway, Suite 300
Las Vegas, NV 89119
Telephone: (702) 805-0290
Facsimile: (702) 805-0291
jschuttert@efsmmlaw.com
dgutke@efsmmlaw.com
bmarshall@efsmmlaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Janna Kanis

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA

JORGE POLANCO, individually,

Plaintiff,

v.

JANNA KANIS, individually; DOES 1 through
10, inclusive; and ROE ENTITIES 11 through 20,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-02184-APG-NJK

**JOINT STIPULATION AND ORDER
TO EXTEND CERTAIN DEADLINES
IN DISCOVERY SCHEDULING
ORDER**

(FIRST REQUEST)

IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Plaintiff Jorge Polanco, through his attorney of record, Joshua L. Benson of Benson Allred Injury Law, and Defendant Janna Kanis, through her attorney of record, David W. Gutke of Evans Fears Schuttert McNulty Mickus, and pursuant to LR IA 6-1 and LR 26-4, that certain deadlines in the Discovery Scheduling Order [ECF No. 15] be continued by sixty (60) days as detailed herein. This is the Parties' first request to extend any deadlines in the Discovery Scheduling Order.

I. DISCOVERY COMPLETED TO DATE

1. Plaintiff served his initial disclosures on January 6, 2025;
2. Defendant served her initial disclosures on January 6, 2025;
3. Plaintiff served his first supplement to initial disclosures on January 15, 2025;

- 1 4. Plaintiff executed medical record releases provided by Defendant on January 21,
- 2 2025;
- 3 5. Defendant sent out subpoenas duces tecum to twenty-three (23) known medical
- 4 providers of Plaintiff for expedited service on January 23, 2025. To date, Defendant
- 5 has received records back from 10 of the 23 providers subpoenaed;
- 6 6. Plaintiff served his second supplement to initial disclosures on February 7, 2025;
- 7 7. Plaintiff responded to Defendant's first set of interrogatories on February 7, 2025;
- 8 8. Plaintiff responded to Defendant's first set of requests for production on February
- 9 7, 2025; and
- 10 9. Defendant served her first supplement to initial disclosures on February 14, 2025.

11 **II. DISCOVERY TO BE COMPLETED**

- 12 1. Additional subpoenas for records as necessary;
- 13 2. Discovery regarding prior automobile accident;
- 14 3. Supplemental productions of documents by all parties;
- 15 4. Follow-up on written discovery requests and responses;
- 16 5. Depositions of parties and non-parties, including coordination of foreign country
- 17 deposition of Defendant;
- 18 6. Disclosure of initial and rebuttal expert witnesses;
- 19 7. Depositions of experts as necessary; and
- 20 8. Depositions of treating physicians as necessary.

21 **III. REASONS WHY DISCOVERY CANNOT BE COMPLETED AND GOOD**

22 **CAUSE FOR A DISCOVERY EXTENSION**

23 Good cause exists to extend discovery deadlines if they "cannot reasonably be met despite
24 the diligence of the party seeking the extension." *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations*, 975 F.2d 604,
25 609 (9th Cir. 1992). As detailed above, the parties have been working diligently to complete
26 discovery in this case, including immediately gathering medical records and propounding written
27 discovery. Notably, however, only 10 of the 23 providers subpoenaed have provided records to
28 date. Further, the parties' schedules and delay in gathering medical records have delayed Plaintiff's

deposition from being conducted yet. Despite the parties' best efforts, additional time is necessary to compile the necessary medical and initial discovery to provide to medical expert(s) in advance of the upcoming initial expert disclosure deadline. As such, Plaintiff and Defendant agree to a proposed extension of the upcoming discovery plan deadlines by 60 days. The parties additionally agree to extend the pretrial order deadline by 60 days to accommodate the proposed new case management deadlines. Counsel for the parties have been diligently working together to prepare this stipulation and obtain an extension of these case management deadlines. Accordingly, no party is prejudiced by the additional time necessary to conduct the remaining discovery. The foregoing circumstances constitute good cause to extend the current case management deadlines, and the parties jointly and in good faith request that this Court enter an Order extending the scheduling deadlines in accordance with their stipulation. There is no trial date set in this case.

IV. PROPOSED REVISED DISCOVERY PLAN

The parties hereby stipulate to and propose the following amendments to the current scheduling deadlines:

	Current Deadline	Proposed Deadline
Final date to amend pleadings or add parties:	February 19, 2025	N/A
Initial expert disclosures:	March 21, 2025	May 20, 2025
Rebuttal expert disclosures:	April 21, 2025	June 20, 2025
Discovery cut off:	May 20, 2025	July 21, 2025
Dispositive motions:	June 20, 2025	August 19 2025
Pre-Trial Order:	July 21, 2025	September 19, 2025
No trial date has been set.		

///

///

///

///

///

1 *Polanco v. Kanis*
2 *Case No. 2:24-cv-02184-APG-NJK*
3 *Joint Stipulation and Order to Extend Certain Deadlines in Discovery Scheduling Order*
4 *(First Request)*

5 DATED: February 19, 2025.

EVANS FEARS SCHUTTERT
MCNULTY MICKUS

/s/ David W. Gutke

Jay J. Schuttart, Esq. (SBN 8656)
David W. Gutke, Esq. (SBN 9820)
Brennen D Marshall, Esq. (SBN 16578)
6720 Via Austi Parkway, Suite 300
Las Vegas, NV 89119

Attorneys for Defendant Janna Kanis

/s/ Joshua L. Benson

Joshua L. Benson, Esq.
Nevada Bar No. 10514
BENSON ALLRED INJURY LAW
333 N. Rancho Dr., Ste 420
Las Vegas, Nevada 89106

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Dated: February 20, 2025

IT IS SO ORDERED


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE